



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,468

12/20/2005

Robert Alexander Van Eibergen Santhagens

NL030751

8162

24737

7590

12/07/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

SWINNEY, JENNIFER B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,468	Applicant(s) VAN EIBERGEN SANTHAGENS, ROBERT ALEXAND	
	Examiner JENNIFER SWINNEY	Art Unit 3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 13-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendments filed 19 October 2009 have been entered. Claims 1-9 and 13-14 remain pending in the application. Claims 10-12 have been cancelled.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because **“the blade thickness at the bending point being larger than the non-bending area blade thickness (Claim 3)”**. Figure 2 depicts, what appears to be a greater blade thickness at the bending point. However, the figures are merely a representation of the claimed invention. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmett (US 4,302,876; as cited in IDS) in view of US Patent No. 5,822,862 to Ferraro and Clark (US 972,436; as previously cited).

With respect to claim 1, Emmett discloses a razor head (it is old and well known in the art for a razor blades to be supported in a razor head) having at least one razor blade (302), each of at least one razor blade comprising an edge portion with a cutting edge (306), the edge portion being bent relative to the further portion (see figures 7 and 8) in a bending zone (area of the bend) spaced from said cutting edge by a bending device.

Emmett does not disclose a top side of a blade attached to a bridge partition of the razor head, the blade wherein at least the edge portion has a material structure hardened by a first heat treatment and in that the bending zone has a locally reheated structure formed subsequent to the first heat treatment. Tempering or annealing steel blades to obtain certain levels of hardness are well known in all blade arts.

Ferraro discloses a top side of a blade (Fig. 3, 40,50,60) attached to a bridge partition (Fig. 3, 80,80a) of a razor head. It would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 3724

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide Emmett with a bridge partition as taught by Ferraro. It is old and well known to provide a bridge partition between blade members of a razor head to provide additional structural support. The bridge partition is also capable of serving as a protective guard as the blade engages the skin, creating a smoother shaving process.

Clark discloses a method of producing a razor blade wherein the entire blade is first hardened and tempered (page 1 lines 86-87) to create a hard edge which can be shaped into a cutting edge (see page 2 lines 1-2). Then areas of the blade which are intended to be bent are locally annealed (reheated) to form softer material in order to create a steel that is more flexible (see page 1 lines 95-99). Clark locally reheats the material (as opposed to reheating the entire blade) in order to preserve the hardness in the area of the cutting edge (see page 1 line 108 through page 2 line 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the technique of first heat treating the entire blade blank, and then subsequently locally annealing portions of the blade which are desired to be flexible as taught by the art of Clark to improve the blade of Emmett for the predictable result of having a hard cutting edge and a flexible central portion which can be easily bent into the angled blade as disclosed by Emmett.

With respect to claim 2, Emmet as modified by Ferraro and Clark does not disclose specific dimensions for the blade, thus Emmett does not disclose the razor head wherein the bending zone is less than 1 mm away from the cutting edge. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 3724

made to modify the head of Emmett to have the bend be under 1 mm away from the cutting edge, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. Examiner further notes that this is an issue of scale and intended use. The larger the head is as a whole, the larger the distance is.

With respect to claim 3, Emmett as modified by Ferraro and Clark, discloses the razor head wherein the razor blade has a blade material thickness, the bending zone having a larger thickness than the blade material thickness at the further portion. Emmett discloses that the blade is bent by "bending conventionally formed blades at some step in their manufacturing process" (column 6 lines 29-31). Through the laws of conservation of mass, a slight bulge will naturally occur during the bending process as a result of squeezing more material into a tighter place. This is why in the bending art, notching is well known to help facilitate bending as material is not needed to be displaced. Displacing the material during any sort of bend will cause a bulge and thus a larger thickness than the non bent area.

With respect to claim 4, Emmet as modified by Ferraro and Clark, discloses the razor head wherein the razor head is at least two razor blades (see figure 8) mounted parallel to each other in a razor head, wherein the edge portion of at least one of said at least two razor blades is bent towards at least one neighboring one of said at least two razor blades and projects towards said at least one neighboring one of said at least two razor blades over a distance perpendicular to the further blade portion of said razor

Art Unit: 3724

blade which is smaller than the spacing between the further portions of these at least two of said razor blades.

With respect to claim 5, Emmett as modified by Ferraro and Clark discloses the razor blade wherein the razor blade is at least two razor blades (see figure 8), wherein each of the two razor blades are attached to a different corresponding fixed bridge partition (Fig. 3, 40, 50, 60, Ferraro), wherein a spacing is present between the cutting edges of at least two of said razor blades. As noted above, Emmett does not specifically disclose any dimensions in regards to the blade setup. Thus Emmett does not disclose the blade assembly wherein the spacing between successive cutting edges is less than 1.2 mm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the blade assembly of Emmett to have the successive edges spaced less than 1.2 mm apart, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmett in view of Ferraro and Clark as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Saturday Night Live "Mach 14" (first aired 5-6-00; episode breakdown provided; hereafter SNL; as previously cited) or Pelizzola (US 1,920,711; as previously cited).

The modified apparatus of Emmett discloses the razor head wherein the razor head comprises at least two razor blades mounted to a different corresponding fixed bridge partition, parallel to each other in a razor head, wherein a spacing is present between the cutting edges. Emmett does not disclose the razor blade wherein the

Art Unit: 3724

cartridge has at least four razor blades. Examiner notes that the use of one, two, three, four, and five blades on shaver head cartridges is well known in the art.

Episode 483 of NBC's Saturday Night Live aired a skit titled "Platinum Mach 14" which features a razor having 14 blades (see provided photo). Pelizzola discloses a razor head having five blades (1-5) in order to shave "more quickly and more regularly, since the hair is cut by the various cutting edges in succession" (column 1 lines 9-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the razor head of Emmett to have at least four blades in view of the art of SNL or Pelizzola in order to improve the quality of the cutting experience.

6. Claims 7, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissen (US 3,489,589; as previously cited) in view of Emmett and Ferraro and in further in view of Clark.

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Nissen discloses a method of manufacturing a razor blade from a razor blade blank for attachment to a fixed bridge partition of a razor head, the method comprising acts of: forming an edge portion (12) of the razor blade blank with a cutting edge and a further portion and hardening the razor blade blank by a heat treatment (10).

Nissen does not disclose reheating after hardening of the razor blade blank a portion of the razor blade blank to bend the edge portion of the razor blade blank relative to the further portion of the razor blade blank and the attaching the further portion is attached to the bridge partition of the razor head.

Emmett discloses a razor blade (302) which is bent during the manufacturing process between the edge and the further portion. The bending takes place during the manufacturing process (column 6 lines 29-31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Nissen to include a bending step in the manufacturing process in order to produce blades which are bent in view of the teachings of Emmett to allow the blades to be rinsed better when inserted into the cartridge. It would have also been obvious to provide a bridge partition between blade members Emmitt as disclosed by Ferraro to provide additional structural support and serve as a protective guard during a shaving process. Examiner notes that the modified apparatus of Nissen still does not disclose reheating the metal after it has already been hardened. The method of Clark discloses locally reheating an already hardened blade strip in order to soften the material to make it more flexible instead of brittle (lines 94- 99). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Nissen to include a local reheating step in the area of the bend in order to prevent the blade from snapping. Examiner notes that the blade is too brittle to bend without reheating.

With respect to claim 9, the modified method of Nissen discloses the cutting edge being ground after hardening, but does not disclose the cutting edge being ground before bending. Examiner notes that cutting edges are typically ground after hardening in order to maintain the edge. Further, it is noted that there exists a finite number of positions for the bending of the blade stock to exist. There are four basic steps to the

Art Unit: 3724

method: heat treating, grinding, bending after the preheating, and sectioning into individual blades. Thus, there are only four possible positions for the preheating and bending steps to take place. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try bending the blade stock after the cutting edge has already been ground as a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. The claim would have been obvious because "a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense."

With respect to claim 13, the modified method of Nissen, discloses the razor head wherein the razor blade has a blade material thickness, the bending zone having a larger thickness than the blade material thickness at the further portion. Emmett discloses that the blade is bent by "bending conventionally formed blades at some step in their manufacturing process" (column 6 lines 29-31). Through the laws of conservation of mass, a slight bulge will naturally occur during the bending process as a result of squeezing more material into a tighter place. This is why in the bending art, notching is well known to help facilitate bending as material is not needed to be displaced. Displacing the material during any sort of bend will cause a bulge and thus a larger thickness than the non bent area.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissen in view of Emmett and Ferraro and further in view of Clark as applied to claim 7 above,

Art Unit: 3724

and further in view of Creamer et al. (US 3,224,900; hereafter Creamer; as previously cited).

With respect to claim 8, the modified apparatus of Nissen does not disclose the local heating of the razor blade blank being carried out by use of a laser. Examiner notes that the use of a laser to heat small areas of metals is well known in the art. Also, lasers are used to melt metals for welding. Creamer discloses that it is well known to heat metals using a laser (column 3 paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the modified method of Nissen to use lasers to locally reheat the metal instead of heated wheels in view of the teachings of Creamer. The claim would have been obvious because a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 13-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3724

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER SWINNEY whose telephone number is (571) 270-5843. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30 am-5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,468
Art Unit: 3724

Page 12

/Jason Daniel Prone/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724

04 December 2009

/JS/